DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 949 JC 740 320

TITLE	Accountability. Technical Group Report No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Montana Commission on Post-Secondary Education, Helena.
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Cost Effectiveness; *Educational Accountability; Educational Objectives; *Evaluation Methods; *Post Secondary Education; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	*Montana

ABSTRACT

The results of a study carried out to devise alternative systems of accountability for postsecondary education and its components, as well as to devise criteria and methods of evaluation to determine effectiveness and progress in meeting goals, are reported. The body of the report is a summary of subcommittee reports on the following: Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Public and Its Representatives; Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Student; Accountability of Individual Faculty, Student and Staff to the Institution; and Accountability of the Public and Its Representatives to the Institution. Appendixes provide an Accountability Chart, the Membership of Accountability Subcommittees; and Interim Reports of the Subcommittees. (DB)

ED 095949

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TECHNICAL GROUP REPORT NO. 1

ACCOUNTABILITY

Prepared for

COMMISSION ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION
201 East 6th Avenue
Helena, Montana 59601

MEMBERS

Ted James, Chairman
Linda Skaar, Vice-Chairman
Magnus Aasheim
V. Edward Bates
Tom Behan
Richard Champoux
William A. Cordingley
Mary Craig
William F. Crowley
Ian Davidson
Carl M. Davis
William Diehl
Raymon Dore
Mary Fenton
Peter Gilligan, Sr.
Russell B. Hart
Joan Kennerly
Marjorie King
Sharon LaBuda
William Mackay
Russell McDonough
John L. McKeon
Dale Moore
John L. Peterson
Lawrence K. Pettit
Garry South
Mickey Sogard
Jessica Stickney
William Warfield

STAFF

Patrick M. Callan, Director
JoEllen Estenson, Deputy Director
Richard F. Bechtel, Research Analyst
Beth Richter, Research Analyst

May, 1974

JC 740 320

This is one of a series of reports by technical consulting groups which are advisory to the Montana Commission on Post-Secondary Education. The data and recommendations presented in these reports reflect the work of the technical group and its members and not the views of the Commission itself.

The primary purpose of these reports is to provide the Commission with information relevant to its task of developing plans for the future of Montana post-secondary education. Each report will be reviewed by the members of the Commission and used in the Commission's deliberations.

The Commission is indebted to the many individuals from institutions of post-secondary education, state agencies and professional organizations who served on the technical consulting groups, and to the institutions and agencies which contributed the data and personal services which made it possible for the technical groups to carry out their charges.

TECHNICAL GROUP ON
ACCOUNTABILITY

Members

William Groff, Department of Revenue, Chairman
JoEllen Estenson, Staff Liaison

Lucille Alt, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology
Dennis Blackketter, Montana State University
Larry J. Blake, Flathead Valley Community College
Einar Brosten, Helena Vo-Tech Center
Galen Bummer, Billings Vo-Tech Center
Victor Burt, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology
Robert Connole, University of Montana
LaRayne DeJules, Miles Community College
Maurice Driscoll, Butte Vo-Tech Center
Jud Flower, Miles Community College
Loren Frazier, Great Falls Vo-Tech Center
John Giese, Missoula Vo-Tech Center
John Giop, Butte Vo-Tech Center
Jim Graham, Butte Vo-Tech Center
J. Les Graham, Miles Community College
Harding Hanson, Western Montana College
Kenneth W. Heikes, Eastern Montana College
Earl Hepler, Northern Montana College
Lorraine Hockett, Northern Montana College
James Hoffman, Dawson College
Jerald Hudspeth, Dawson College
Bruce Johnson, Flathead Valley Community College
Charles Kintz, Dawson College
Harrison Lane, Northern Montana College
Marie Larish, Helena Vo-Tech Center
Don Liles, Helena Vo-Tech Center
Jack Morrison, Billings Vo-Tech Center
Bruce Moyer, Missoula Vo-Tech Center
Richard McConnan, Montana State University
Robert J. McRae, Eastern Montana College
Floyd Nobbs, Great Falls Vo-Tech Center
Tom Nopper, Business Manager, Montana State University
Richard Roeder, Montana State University
Larry Rooney, Flathead Valley Community College

TECHNICAL GROUP ON
ACCOUNTABILITY

Members

Irvin Scheidt, Billings Vo-Tech Center
W. Dewey Skelton, Missoula Vo-Tech Center
Carl Spinti, Great Falls Vo-Tech Center
Koehler S. Stout, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology
Dale Tash, Western Montana College
John Tibbs, University of Montana
John Van deWetering, University of Montana
C. Robert Waterman, Eastern Montana College
Alan Zetler, Western Montana College

ACCOUNTABILITY

Charge

1. To devise alternative systems of accountability (effectiveness and efficiency in meeting goals) for post-secondary education and its components, including, but not limited to the following issues:

   a) accountability of post-secondary education to the public and its representatives

   b) accountability of post-secondary education to the student

   c) accountability of the individual (faculty, student, staff) to the institution

   d) accountability of the public and its representatives to the institution

   e) accountability of the administration to the student and faculty

2. To devise criteria and methods of evaluation to determine effectiveness and progress in meeting goals, including techniques for determining the relationship of educational outcomes to financial resources invested.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Public and its Representatives	3
Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Student	8
Accountability of Individual Faculty, Student and Staff to the Institution	11
Accountability of the Public and its Representatives to the Institution	14
APPENDICES	
Appendix A-Accountability Chart	19
Appendix B-Membership of Accountability Sub-committees	23
Appendix C-Interim Reports of the Sub-committees	25

TECHNICAL REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY

INTRODUCTION

Accountability as a concept rests on the evaluation of performance as it relates to previously agreed upon objectives. Without a clear-cut and specific statement of purposes, measurement is meaningless. The basic idea underlying this concept is a comparison - preferably in quantitative terms - of outcomes and cost. The implication is that objectives in higher education have been unclear and management flabby and that if institutions of post-secondary education were persuaded to clarify their goals and to rationalize their operations with respect to these goals, a given level of performance could be achieved at less cost or existing appropriations would support better performance. Accountability becomes the chosen "instrument of persuasion".

The underlying principle of the Institution is a commitment to the value of lifelong learning within all approaches along the continuum of education, including academic, vocational, avocational, physical and aesthetic pursuits. To remove the availability of any one of these diminishes the scope of resources which will help develop and realize the broadest capacities. These, by their very nature are difficult to measure, but are an essential part of higher education.

Howard R. Bowen states that "accountability would mean maximum effectiveness in achieving stated goals in relation to cost, and evaluation of each level of higher education on the basis of stated goals and hard facts about performance." He goes on to give us the "ingredients" for a system of accountability:

> "A clear statement of goals with an ordering of priorities.
>
> Allocation of resources toward maximum returns in relation to the goals.
>
> Cost and benefit analysis including allocating of cost and benefits to particular institutions and to programs within institutions.

Evaluation of actual results.

Reporting on the evaluation to governing boards, to sources of financial support--including possibly the general public--and also to faculty and administrative staff."

If such a system of accountability were adopted as workable, then the purpose of accountability (as so defined) are several:

"To provide justification for appropriations (placing the burden of proof on the applicant).

To require clarification of objectives.

To improve operating efficiency.

To provide incentives for improved performance.

To provide a base for relating compensation of administrative and professional staff to performance.

To identify examples of excellent operation so that these examples may be emulated."

Accountability then becomes the means for assuring the state's citizenry that it is getting its money's worth from higher education in the state.

An alternative purpose of post-secondary education is to provide educational experiences for those who seek enrichment in areas not specifically career-oriented. In other words, "education for its own sake" is recognized as a legitimate function of post-secondary education but does not lend itself to quantifiable analysis.

The Technical Committee on Accountability, recognizing the many facets of the term have, in this report, addressed themselves to several issues of accountability in post-secondary education which are quantifiable.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION TO THE PUBLIC AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES

Measurement

The trend for the public and representatives of the public to ask questions of and to expect answers from institutions of post-secondary education is increasing. The catch word is "accountability." However, showing the public and its representatives that these institutions are accountable is not easy. In fact, the measurement of outcomes of numerous programs included in post-secondary education is increasingly difficult and markedly different than measurement methods used by private industry. Generally speaking, the reason for the difference is that industry is mostly product oriented and institutions of post-secondary education are service oriented with a product that is difficult to describe and harder to measure. That service or product is something called education. Outcome is often a subjective issue with so many variables as to thus far defy definite measurement. For example, a well-trained electorate, a personal sense of perspective, a 'civilizing experience', and personal satisfaction are traditional and appropriate outcomes that cannot be quantified.

Until recently, managers and governing boards of post-secondary institutions felt little need to obtain and use "outcome" information for planning and accountability. A few reasons for this are: (1) Historically, institutions of post-secondary education have enjoyed nearly unlimited moral and financial support, and they have been afforded considerable autonomy in their operations. As a result, when compared to the private sector, institutions of post-secondary education have not felt as much pressure for accountability in the use of their resources. (2) Decision makers (administrators and governing board members) are often "means" rather than "ends" oriented. In a crisis situation, the concern is with the question "what is wrong with the course of action being taken?" instead of the question "what are we trying to achieve?" (3) In the past, decisions were based almost exclusively on historical input, cost, and activity. Little or no thought was given to outcomes to be derived from the operation of programs. Money was allocated largely on the basis of student population, number of graduates, or other quantitative measures related directly to costs rather than to goals and objectives of a particular program.

Because of these and other reasons, outcome measurement of institutions of post-secondary education has not been perfected. Millions of dollars have been spent on studies by such groups as the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE (NCHEMS). Unfortunately, by their own admission, these groups have not been able to report effectively on outcome measurement. Their frustration is contained in statements such as the conclusion in a June 1973 NCHEMS publication entitled Outcome-Oriented Planning in Higher Education: An Approach or an Impossibility?

That conclusion is:

> "Whether or not an outcome-oriented approach to planning will prove to be a viable approach or an impossibility remains to be seen. Dr. Fred Balderston may have summed up the situation best in these words:
>
> > We have bumped hard into the question of outputs and their measurements because, among other things, we are seeking how to link the resources used to the results achieved--in other words, to link inputs with outputs. It turns out that in the long history of concern about the processes and activities of education, we have achieved only a very imperfect grasp of the nature of its results. Now we are having to tackle the problems of output definition and measurement under forced draft, for higher education has come to the front of public attention both as a major social problem and as a major contributor to social change and economic development. . . . The job we have to do is urgent, important and controversial. If we had time, we might do well to sympathize with ourselves for taking it on. (Balderston, 1970: 11).
>
> It is important to point out that in 1970, when this statement was made, it was considered by many to be a long-range prophecy. Today, however, the need for and urgency of using information about the outcomes of higher education programs and institutions as a primary basis for planning and management is understood and recognized as a compelling reality."

Much of this dilemma is due to the diversity of programs offered at a particular institution. For example, tying in the the objectives of a residence hall to that of a security department and relating the objectives of both of these programs to an instructional objective becomes extremely difficult.

Program Budgeting

Perhaps the first thing to do is find an effective tool to establish and measure the performance of post-secondary education. One of the best methods available is a management tool called "program budgeting". Program budgeting is not an instrument of fiscal control, an accounting system, or even a new name for a more effective bookkeeping system. Neither is it line-item budgeting. Program budgeting may best be described as a method by which decisions regarding the appropriate allocation of resources are made. The system identifies and organizes the activities of an institution in terms of its objectives, displays costs of these activities over an extended period of time, and relates these activities and costs to the outputs associated with the institution's objectives. As an institution's objectives change, the program and its elements can be altered to meet the new goal requirements. Implementation of a program budget must be based on the identification of specific institutional objectives. These objectives should be identified by the governing authorities for the institutions generally in consultation with representatives from the general public, students, and the post-secondary institutions. Objectives internally need to be developed at each institution by faculty, administration and staff. After objectives are identified, the program budget system can be established in a manner that allows dollars and other resources to be aggregated and distributed in relation to output-producing programs as well as to organizational components of the institution. The results of this relationship can then be displayed. Models of program budget systems are available from Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) or other similar organizations.

Governing authorities should encourage the use of program budgeting since it provides an effective means of expressing their understanding of institutional objectives and the financial and

other requirements needed to meet those objectives. Outcomes of a properly organized and implemented program budgeting system can and should be measured and evaluated.

Financial Statements and Audit Reports

Once a program budgeting system has been established, institutions of post-secondary education should file complete annual financial statements following guidelines established by such recognized associations as the American Council on Education (ACE), the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), or counterpart associations for community colleges and vocational-technical centers. These financial statements will allow different types of institutions to compare with one another or with similar institutions in the region or nation. The statements should clarify how financial and other resources were allocated by a particular institution to reach its objectives.

After the financial statements are prepared, an audit should be performed by a competent audit agency or an independent certified public accountant, following auditing standards prescribed by the American Institute for Certified Public Accountants in its industry audit guide entitled Audits of Colleges and Universities. Similar standards should be followed for the audits of community colleges and vocational-technical centers. Audit reports should be made available to the public and its representatives together with any additional explanatory material. A comprehensive audit report is a valuable management tool and should be part of the regular operating routine of an institution.

Post-secondary education in any state is not an island by itself but an integral part of the national post-secondary educational system. Therefore, accounting principles established by nationally recognized authorities should be utilized in the development and display of financial data. The governing bodies of post-secondary educational units should not allow local authorities to impose financial accounting systems that fail to recognize national standards.

Other Reports

Institutions of post-secondary education may find it necessary

and desirable to provide additional reports and definitions to the public and its representatives. Optional reports that presently exist at some of the institutions include faculty load, credit hours, number of students enrolled by discipline, and library holdings. These reports should be closely coordinated by governing authorities to insure the reliability and comparability of the data. In addition, reporting formats should vary to reflect the assigned mission of the institutions involved.

Accrediting Associations

Institutions of post-secondary education are accredited by various regional and national accrediting associations. Periodically, representatives of these associations go to an institution and perform an in-depth evaluation review of all program elements. The institution's programs are compared with preestablished standards and a detailed report showing strengths and weaknesses is prepared for each institution.

Financing Measurements

It must be recognized that the preceding measurement devices will place an additional economic drain on an institution's financial resources. It is also necessary to determine - in advance - how much measurement will be needed and then allocate resources for this purpose. In other words, as with other programs of an institution, it is necessary to set objectives of measurement and budget those objectives accordingly.

Summary

We hope that if institutional objectives are specifically stated, quantitative and non-quantitative measurements may be developed to permit institutions to better evaluate institutional success. Whatever method is used, though, should be thought out in advance with appropriate guidelines established so that the necessary data to compare financial allocations to the expected outcomes may be readily obtained. After the data is recorded, then it should be set forth in a suitable manner so that the public and its representatives will have little trouble understanding it. Audits or evaluations of this information and the

statements reflecting that information should then be performed to certify to the validity of those statements. In this manner the public and its representatives may be made aware of what the institutions of post-secondary education are expected to perform and if they are performing to that level of expectation.

It is clear that accountability does not stand alone. It should always be a two-way communication. Its exercise is related not only to administration, planning and organization, effectiveness and efficiency, but to sound relationships - formal and informal, special and general - reflecting active interest in institutional affairs. Is this relationship measurable? We believe that ACCOUNTABILITY OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION TO THE STUDENT* can be measured by the following criteria.

Accurate and Complete Program Information

The first area of Post-Secondary Education Accountability to the student is to be accountable for accurate and complete program information. This can be measured objectively by careful study of the catalog printed by each institution.

The catalog should reveal accurate and complete information so that the student can answer questions ranging from entrance requirements and application procedures to understanding the role and scope and graduation requirements. The catalog should reveal step by step individual program requirements. Programs should be relevant to the needs of the student, community, state and region. In addition, student recruitment should be factual and honest.

Transferability

Absolute accuracy is necessary to insure that each student is fully aware of the transferability of courses from institution to institution. Educational institutions must conduct ongoing studies, aligning catalog programs, credits, and courses with each other; this insures the rights of students to transfer without loss of time, money, and credits. Transferability is measurable objectively by studying the success of students who transfer. The quality and content of subjects should be coordi-

*The term "student" includes all persons attending post-secondary institutions in Montana regardless of age, credits carried and desired outcomes.

Transferability (continued)

nated on a University System basis.

Involvement in Decision Making

By studying the organizational chart of each institution, post-secondary education may be held accountable for student involvement in decision making. Decision making is an important part of education and post-secondary institutions should include students in most levels of decision making.

Quality Instruction

Accountability for quality instruction is subjective to measure. Quality instruction begins with a faculty willing to subject itself to accountability studies, and ends with the finished product, (the student) showing his abilities as being compatible with desired outcomes.

The responsibility of faculty members to students includes adapting to the continuously changing requirements of fields of knowledge in a dynamic society through instruction, through research and scholarship (in the universities) and through public service.

Counseling

Counseling is a continuing, ongoing process. Accountability requires that citizens be provided adequate counseling services which articulate opportunities in other post-secondary institutions or fields of endeavor.

Accountability in this area is measured objectively. Student-counselor ratio, counseling center facilities, and counseling procedures related to students from initial enrollment to graduation are measurable. Counseling should include all personal, vocational and academic areas.

Placement Service

Placement, although used primarily upon graduation, is a continuing, ongoing process. Placement services should vary

from institution to institution, and from program to program within institutions, in that some students train for employment not only in the community or state, but in the regional or national market. Other students do not need nor want placement. Recruiters should be accurate with students about potential employment and placement.

The Northwest Association for Accreditation conducts periodic investigations of area institutions. These studies hold institutions accountable in many areas including the above mentioned.

Another important relationship is that of the INDIVIDUAL FACULTY, STUDENT AND STAFF TO THE INSTITUTION.

Faculty Accountability

Accountability of the faculty must be understood in two ways. First, faculty time needs to be translated into costs for the purpose of obtaining sufficient information for proper planning. (The dangers inherent in the misuse of statistical data are manifold. For example, "cost" of an individual faculty member should never be a part of that faculty member's evaluation. To do so would give a false image of faculty structure.)

Most of the information required for the purposes of financial planning should be obtained through proper computer programming and may be provided quarter by quarter automatically from existing records, (e.g., number of classes taught, enrollment, etc.).

Behind this automatically gathered information must rest a body of supplementary information that may best be standardized as the basis for planning assumptions. For example, the system might conclude that for each hour in a classroom a faculty may assume to have spent, on the average, two or three hours in preparation. These standardized generalizations might best be established through an inter-unit committee operating with material gathered from individual unit committees, since supplemental standards may vary from unit to unit.

A faculty load form should be designed to provide the additional information that cannot be gathered from the computer or standardized in the above fashion. For example, committee responsibilities, unusual advising tasks, and research might well be reported by the individual faculty member on a reporting form required each quarter or each academic year. Such a form would have to be broad enough in the categories it covers to incorporate the range of responsibilities within faculties and from institution to institution. This form, too, might well be designed by an inter-unit committee that depended heavily upon the NCHEM's material.

Secondly, accountability of individual faculty performance

can be handled only through an insistence upon the assumption of appropriate responsibilities by peers and administrators at every level. Such an accountability can be regularly attended to through an annual faculty review process that includes an analysis of research, teaching, and public service.

Teaching quality is a necessary component of individual accountability for faculty. In the Vo-Tech and Community College quality measurement may require techniques different from those used at the colleges and universities whose mission also includes broad research and public service roles. Teaching evaluation must include student judgments and peer judgments, and should constitute an important part of an annual review. The work done by Kenneth Eble at the University of Utah is valuable for the development of particular forms.

Student Accountability

The accountability of the student can be measured only in terms of his educational performance and by understanding his own goals. He must accumulate an appropriate number of hours to achieve a degree and his performance will ordinarily be measured by performance level. Aside from grades and credits, which are intended to reflect academic achievement, the students' accountability rests in an ethical and legal realm. Scholarship students have a special responsibility to perform according to the terms of the scholarship. Above all, he must feel some obligation for the protection of the freedom of the institution, and we hope that in the future he would share a sense of obligation as a citizen to provide adequately for the support of the institution.

Staff Accountability

Staff accountability can be determined only in terms of specific job descriptions so the tasks performed may be measured against institutional needs and time and effort invested.

There should be some effort to assign staff costs to specific programs. The hazard in quantifying the usage of time in such a manner is that the fraction becomes a wild guess and, therefore, is often useless.

Staff Accountability (continued)

The extent to which each employee performs satisfactorily can be evaluated best by his supervisor, who must be responsible for the quality of work done by those under his guidance.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF ADMINISTRATORS

For the purpose of planning, administrative costs, whenever possible, should be assigned to specific programs, although the hazard of arbitrary assignment of time percentages needs to be cautioned against.

Before accountability can be dealt with realistically for administrators, careful job descriptions must be developed. This must be a first step.

The administrative structure is responsible for assuring that the interrelated elements of the institution function according to the sound principles of accountability as set forth in the general report of this committee. It is the central administration that has the ultimate responsibility for interpreting the institution to the state and for assuring a sensitive response on the part of the institution to the needs of the state. Ultimately they are accountable for the operation and quality of the institution to the Board of Regents for the colleges and universities, or local boards for the Vo-Tech and community colleges. The lesser administrators are those most responsible for assuring the successful operation of the system of interrelated accountability that appears elsewhere in this document.

All administrators must have the courage to make qualitative decisions that can be defended on appropriate, rational grounds and be dedicated to the principles of academic freedom.

Without such leadership the institution cannot operate in a well-integrated and socially useful manner. Faculty, staff and student evaluation of administrators should take place regularly.

Finally, another accountable relationship is that of THE PUBLIC AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES TO THE INSTITUTION. It may be analyzed in four components, namely:

1. Analysis of need
2. Satisfaction of need
3. Establishment of goals and objectives
4. Adequate funding to meet those goals

The first two areas pertain more to the total citizenry of the state inasmuch as the analysis of need is that of the need for all forms of post-secondary education. The satisfaction of that need is through the assignment of responsibilities to various institutions. The resulted accountability of the public to institutions rests in the latter two areas, namely, the assignment of goals and objectives to each institution or groups of institutions and the subsequent adequate funding to meet those goals.

Although, throughout the establishment of evaluation and accountability of these four areas, it is imperative that the public recognize the expertise it already possesses in the institutions and their representatives, and to utilize to the fullest extent their advisory abilities. It is, therefore, also incumbent upon the institutions, their staff and faculties, to assist the representatives of the public in fulfilling these responsibilities.

Through the following four-step process, the public and its representatives can be assisted in the development of an effective and efficient system of post-secondary education geared to the needs of the citizens of the State of Montana and can be assured that the institutions which they establish and charter will have the means to accomplish those goals.

Analysis of Need

The first, and most vital, link in the accountability of the public and its representatives to the institution is the continued analysis of existing and anticipated educational needs of the citizens of the state. These needs include, but are not limited to: vocational-technical, academic, professional, avocational, remedial, upgrading, retraining, continuing, and graduate education; research; and public service with an emphasis upon

accessibility. One example of this process is the current study being conducted by the Commission on Post-Secondary Education. In order to satisfy this need, this process must be a continuing and on-going analysis of need.

The measure of accountability of the satisfaction of this need is the acceptance of the recommendations of such studies by the citizens of the state.

Satisfaction of Need

Following the analysis of need for post-secondary education, the public and its representatives must then assure that those needs are satisfied through the development of a system of post-secondary education and the assignment of various aspects of that education to the various institutions and groups of institutions in that system.

Establishment of Goals and Objectives

Once the analysis of need and the assignment of responsibilities to various institutions and groups of institutions has been made, the accountability of the public and its representatives to the institution can be more specific. For each and every institution, it is a responsibility of the public to establish the goals and objectives of that institution both for the institution itself and its interrelationship with the balance of the system. These goals and objectives should be sufficiently specific as to allow for adequate evaluation based upon outcomes.

The measure of accountability for satisfaction of this area is the comparison of outcomes against prescribed goals and objectives. Although evaluation of outcomes in many cases is very difficult, given the current state of the art, they can still be used with a recognition of their reliability.

Adequate Funding to Meet Goals

Once the public and its representatives have established the goals and objectives for the particular institution, it is then obligated to assure that adequate funding is furnished to

Adequate Funding to Meet Goals (continued)

meet those goals and objectives. Although it is the institution's responsibility to husband what funds are provided and to accomplish its goals and objectives in the most efficient manner, if the original funding is inadequate, the responsibility lies with the public and not with the institution.

The adequacy of funding can be measured in a number of ways, however, the most appropriate is comparative evaluation. This can be based upon the statistics recently developed by the National Council on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education, salary comparisons such as those developed by the American Association of University Professors, and on the level of funding for similar institutions within Montana's geographical region. It should be emphasized that, until better measures are developed, these or similar measures must be used or the quality of post-secondary education cannot be maintained.

CONCLUSION

"Accountability" in the one sense of the term means communication. Communication, in turn, is the essence of leadership. It involves constant re-examination of goals, reiteration of purpose to public and institutional staff, and repeated evaluation of means to ends. Therefore, the present challenge to post-secondary education for accountability must be turned into an opportunity for renewed concern with institutional interpretation. If the concepts in this report are developed and used, the response will go a long way toward restoring confidence in the system and increasing the priority now assigned. Reappraisal is post-secondary education's best response to the central question, where does accountability end and control for political or other non-educational purposes, begin? Autonomy and accountability must assume a delicate balance for both protection of the public interest and conservation of the efficiency of freedom so essential to effective scholarship, teaching, and service. If the system of post-secondary education remains open to examination and to change, it will emerge from increased scrutiny and pressure with greater stability and a potential for better education and for public service.

The body of this report is a summary of sub-committee reports

CONCLUSION (continued)

restated in a format appropriate to the charge to the committee. The individual committee reports which present additional material in a somewhat different format are included in the appendices.

Special recognition should be given to Subcommittee #6 for their efforts in synthesizing the work of the five subcommittees.

APPENDICES

ACCOUNTABILITY CHART

WHO is Accountable?	TO WHOM (Primary Responsibility)?	FOR WHAT?
Institutions	Public and Its Representatives	Execution of policy Accomplishment of specific goals and objectives reflected by: a) Development, selection, and implementation of instructional programs b) Outcome measurements c) Annual financial statements and audit reports (or any other types of reports)
Institutions	Students	Accurate and complete program information Transferability Involvement in decision-making Quality instruction Counselling Placement

APPENDIX A

ACCOUNTABILITY CHART

WHO is Accountable?	TO WHOM (Primary Responsibility)?	FOR WHAT?
Faculty	Institution	Produce program outcomes consistent with pre-selected objectives at a performance standard appropriate for the instructiona program.
Student	Institution	Educational performance consistent with an understanding of his own goals and those of the institution.
Staff	Immediate Supervisor	Performance of tasks determined by specific job descriptions and measured against institutional needs.

ACCOUNTABILITY CHART

WHO is Accountable?	TO WHOM (Primary Responsibility?	FOR WHAT?
Administrators	1) Faculty and Students 2) Board of Regents and/or Local Governing Boards 3) Public and Representatives	Provide leadership that a) opens adequate communication channels b) promotes institutional goals and objectives, good scholarship, and decision-making based on sound management principles c) promotes framework for participatio and the process for ongoing review and revision of goals and objective Performance of duties specified in job description Interpretation of institution to the state and assuring a sensitive response to the needs of the state.

ACCOUNTABILITY CHART

WHO is Accountable?	TO WHOM (Primary Responsibility)?	FOR WHAT?
Public and Its Representatives	Institution	1) Ongoing analysis of post-secondary educational needs of the citizens of the state 2) Assure the satisfaction of those needs through well developed system of post-secondary education 3) Assist in the establishment of goals and objectives 4) Obligation to assure that adequate funding is furnished to meet those goals and objectives
Board of Regents	Institutions	Legally responsible for management and supervision

MEMBERSHIP OF ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-COMMITTEES

Subcommittee #1

Richard Roeder, Montana State University, Chairman
Einar Brosten, Helena Vo-Tech Center
Harding Hanson, Western Montana College
Bruce Johnson, Flathead Valley Community College
Dave Keltz, Butte Vo-Tech Center
Robert J. McRae, Eastern Montana College
Irvin Scheidt, Billings Vo-Tech Center

Subcommittee #2

Dale Tash, Western Montana College, Chairman
Lucille Alt, Montana College of Mineral Science & Technology
Jim Graham, Butte Vo-Tech Center
Charles Kintz, Dawson College
Larry Rooney, Flathead Valley Community College
John Tibbs, University of Montana

Subcommittee #3

Robert Connole, University of Montana, Chairman
Jud Flower, Miles Community College
Jerald Hudspeth, Dawson College
Harrison Lane, Northern Montana College
Marie Larish, Helena Vo-Tech Center
Bruce Moyer, Missoula Vo-Tech Center
C. Robert Waterman, Eastern Montana College

Subcommittee #4

Loren Frazier, Great Falls Vo-Tech Center, Chairman
Dennis Blackketter, Montana State University
LaRayne DeJulis, Miles Community College
John Giop, Butte Vo-Tech Center
Earl Hepler, Northern Montana College
Jack Morrison, Billings Vo-Tech Center
Koehler S. Stout, Montana College of Mineral Science & Technology

MEMBERSHIP OF ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-COMMITTEES

Subcommittee #5

James Hoffman, Dawson College, Chairman
Galen Bummer, Billings Vo-Tech Center
Victor Burt, Montana College of Mineral Science & Technology
Richard McConnan, Montana State University
Floyd Nobbs, Great Falls Vo-Tech Center
W. Dewey Skelton, Missoula Vo-Tech Center
Alan Zetler, Western Montana College

Subcommittee #6

Tom Nopper, Montana State University, Chairman
Larry J. Blake, Flathead Valley Community College
John Giese, Missoula Vo-Tech Center
J. Les Graham, Miles Community College
Kenneth W. Heikes, Eastern Montana College
Lorraine Hockett, Northern Montana College
Don Liles, Helena Vo-Tech Center
John Van deWetering, University of Montana

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Public and its Representatives"

Sources of Public Concern

The growth of post-secondary education since World War II has made it one of the largest areas of public expenditure. Growth of educational programs - and in the numbers of institutions of education beyond the high school - has not always been coordinated. Consequently, a general feeling exists that educational expansion has been unmanaged and uncontrolled. Fears exist that tax dollars are not being spent wisely and effectively. Perhaps this attitude is best summarized by the notion that university professors work ten hours per week and are paid $18,000 per year. The upshot has been a widespread attempt to exert public control over education through executive and legislative leadership over educational policies and development. Such attempts must be qualified by the fact that education differs from other governmental programs. By its attempts to insulate educational institutions from politics in any partisan sense, society recognizes this difference. But educational institutions are <u>public</u> and consequently owe some degree of accountability to the taxpayer and his representatives.

However, attempts to establish the details of such accountability raise difficult questions: What degree of state supervision is appropriate? Who should exercise it? How "independent" should educational institutions be? Are there "internal" policy areas where public officials should fear to tread? How can regents, governor and the legislature be given information and advice on educational matters?

Accountability to the Public

Any system of accountability must take institutional goals into consideration because there is no other way of ascertaining whether or not a particular institution is carrying out its mission. The purpose of vo-tech education is vastly different from that of the university system, and within the latter there are very significant differences of purpose among the several units.

Institutions must respond to the public's needs, but the immediacy of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

response will vary for different types of education. Since vo-tech is more directly involved in the market place, it will respond more quickly to public demands than will the university system with its more traditional functions.

Educational institutions have a responsibility to provide the public with information about their goals and what they are doing to achieve them. Adequate public support for education will come only with public understanding. Education cannot expect the public to be generous in its support if a failure of understanding results in suspicions that post-secondary education is running amuck. How institutions do this will differ with different kinds of education. In the case of vo-tech, more so than many aspects of the university system, overall accountability will be achieved if vo-tech centers are ascertaining the market's needs and if their students are able to function effectively on the jobs for which they have been trained.

All institutions of post-secondary education can make effective use of the advisory committees established by law. These can be useful feedback mechanisms. Advisory groups for institutions and for specific colleges of the university system are a useful means of furthering communications with the public and of increasing the number of informed friends of education among the public. As a further point of being held accountable to the public, institutions ought to examine the adequacy of the educational and cultural opportunities they are providing for adults.

Accountability to Public's Representatives

While institutions of post-secondary education have responsibilities of being accountable directly to the public, regular day-to-day accountability can be achieved only through the public's representatives. The primary agencies of public control are the constitutional agencies and officials: the board of public education and superintendent of public instruction in the case of vo-tech and the board of regents and the commissioner of higher education in the case of the university system. These officials have the responsibility of approving and coordinating institutional goals since they are the formulators and administrators of the broad educational policy for the state within the constitutional

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

mandate of providing "a system of education which will develop the full educational potential of each person." (Art. X, Sec. 1)

Because of the newness of these constitutional provisions, institutional arrangements are, at this point, necessarily fluid. But, the roles of these agencies are inherently ambiguous. For example, from the point of view of a unit of the university system, the purpose of the board of regents is to represent and defend to the public the needs of the university system - as seen by that particular unit. From the point of view of the governor and legislature the regents are expected to determine, with olympian independence, the needs of the university system and to decide policies and approve or disapprove programs in a manner consistent with state policies and resources.

Nevertheless, the board of public education and board of regents have to be the primary centers of public involvement in the definition of goals and the primary means of public assessment of educational needs. They also have to be the primary centers for measuring the educational effectiveness of the programs they approve. Both boards sitting together as the "state board of education" are responsible "for long-range planning, and for coordinating and evaluating policies and programs for the state's educational systems." (Art. X, Sec. 9) Presumably, the state board will fulfill these purposes largely through the additional constitutional requirement that it submit unified budget requests. In making budgetary decisions board members will and ought to reflect a consciousness of the taxpayer's interests. However, once the budget has been agreed upon, it behooves board members to represent the cause of education to the public and to the legislature.

Clearly, institutions of post-secondary education are accountable to their respective boards not only that their funds are spent legally but wisely and frugally. But to what extent should board members concern themselves with "internal" matters? There are probably no single or completely clear lines of demarcation which could answer this question, but the boards and the commissioner of higher education and the superintendent of public education have to evolve a method of operation among themselves and with the chief administrator of educational institutions. This method will have to be worked out so as not to shut off contact between educational administrators and the governor and the legislature.

How education fares in the state depends to a considerable degree on the governor's attitude toward education. It is not likely to flourish if he is hostile or indifferent. Obviously, the governor has a great deal of influence on education because his executive budget shapes the state's general fiscal policies which largely determine the slice of the pie for education. The state board of education will have to influence the executive budget through its best representation of its own budget requests.

The governor also exercises influence in more subtle ways. Not the least important is his power to appoint members of the board of regents and board of public education. Also, it is within the executive branch that the state's accounting system exists. It is the responsibility of the executive to impose accounting requirements which prevent the misuse of funds. The same requirements have to generate data which can be used to establish fiscal accountability, i.e. that the budget allocation of institutions are in accord with the intent of appropriation laws and are consistent with the institution's stated goals and priorities.

Perhaps most difficult of discernment is the proper relationship of educational institutions to the legislature. Obviously, the legislature must control appropriations. How the individual legislator feels about appropriation requests will be in large part decided by his sensitivity to the demands of the public and how he reads those demands. Educational administrators, on the other hand, must look beyond immediate demands or necessities to the technical feasability of programs and their effects, for good or ill, on the overall educational goals of his institution. The legislator needs to understand the administrator's considerations as well as to feel the public's demands, for only then will he be in a position to weigh the relative merits of conflicting requests for limited funds. Also, it is only with such un erstanding that the legislature will avoid the temptation to make appropriation bills too specific.

One of the most important instruments of accountability is the legislative post audit. It is only with this means that the legislature can be assured that all those with educational responsibilities have spent moneys legally and in accord with legislative intent. The office of post auditor should also be in a position to aid individual institutions to develop accounting and reporting techniques which satisfy the needs of the legislature (and executive)

without negating the accounting needs of the institution. It is primarily the function of the post audit to determine whether funds were expended on the items budgeted and that they were spent efficiently and wisely.

Are there areas of "internal educational policy", such as the hiring and firing of faculty, course offerings and their contents, choice of textbooks, etc., where the legislature should not impose its will? Probably some legislative interference with curriculum is to be expected. Positive requirements (i.e. that certain subjects must be taught) are more acceptable than negative ones (i.e. prohibitions on teaching certain subjects), but if carried too far even those can throw a whole educational system out of balance.

Above all, the legislature and others should avoid violating accepted cannons of academic freedom. In this regard, the university is a peculiarly sensitive institution because it must be not just a transmitter of information but also the generator of new ideas. In performing its latter function, there will be times when the university will be unpopular. But it needs to be shielded form efforts to curtail that freedom which is necessary to the uncovering, testing, and dissemination of new ideas. In the sense that a fleeting public opinion should not be its master, the university is not a democratic institution.

In fulfilling its purpose as a generator of new ideas the university must allow and encourage some faculty to engage in research - which costs money. Should the legislature specify areas it will or will not support? There is always a temptation, in response to public demand, to support special research projects by earmarking funds. Closely related is the question of teaching loads. Some state legislatures have succumbed to the temptation of imposing teaching loads by statute. Teaching loads have to be evaluated in terms of the teacher's other responsibilities which in turn are related to institutional goals. (Perhaps each institution could do a better job of clarifying job descriptions.) Generally speaking, legislative interference with curriculum, teaching loads, and research programs are intrusions which would better be left to the board of regents and board of public education. Of course, before they approve any new, large-scale, long-range programs, regents should be assured of legislative support.

Detailed and excessive legislative interference will imbalance educational programs and make planning impossible. Certainly, education does not need pressure from individual legislators for favors. Education does need information about expectations of future resources so that it can plan for the future. It also needs to have clarified the agencies to which it is accountable. If it is expected to be accountable to a plethora of committees, the upshot can only be disruption. All must recognize that there are limits to accountability. Narrow concept of efficiency will destroy effectiveness and seriously damage the quality of educational experience. The only alternative to considerable degrees of institutional autonomy are institutions run by remote control by bureaucracies in Helena. Proponents of "accountability" proceed on the unexamined assumption that centralized control is efficient, i.e. that it holds down costs and improves services to the public. This is not necessarily true. For example, such things as centralized purchasing, imposition of state architectural requirements and the like create new volumes of bureaucratic red tape.

Those who would wish education to be more "business-like" should not fail to understand that in some areas of business enterprise there is a growing realization - especially in parts of Europe that are in advance of the United States in this respect - that success will evade those efforts where the engineering values of the assembly line exclude human values and sensibilities. Increasingly, business enterprise is recognizing that impersonal, mechanically efficient techniques are not necessarily the surest means to the greatest output of the best quality at the lowest price.

Furthermore, educational activities are not comparable to other areas of state activity. They are far more complex--and delicate, some would say "sacral". Most areas of education involve imponderables that do not submit to quantification. Neither can the classromm and the laboratory be regarded in the same light as an assembly line. All must beware that with members of the "cult of efficiency" budgeting, auditing, and accounting have a way of becoming ends in themselves.

There is no methodological magic that will provide "accountability". Inappropriate attempts to quantify and accumulate comparable data will solve nothing. But they will succeed in inflating educational and governmental bureaucracies.

What is needed is communication. In the final analysis, "accountability" in the best sense of the term means communication. Communication, in turn, is the essence of leadership. It involves constant reexamination of goals, reiteration of purpose to public and institutional staff, and repeated evaluation of means to ends. In the past educational administrators may have been too insensitive to the need to communicate with the public and its representatives and have, therefore, appeared less than candid. Representatives of the public, on the other hand, need to develop and abide by channels of communication to educational administration.

PRELIMINARY REPORT-REVISED

Sub-Committee #2: Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Student

Educational institutions exist primarily for the benefit of students. It follows that all universities, colleges and vo-tech centers are accountable, each in their own way, to the student.

Each post-secondary institution in Montana operates under a restricted role and scope prescribed and approved by governing boards. Any change in role or scope must, therefore, be approved by these governing boards. Curriculum changes involving new courses, programs and degrees usually originate at the department level and must be recommended by the faculties of the unit, as well as by the administration, before appearing as a recommendation for approval by the governing board. The very definition of "accountability" demands that students be allowed to participate in the development of an institution's role and scope. Accountability also requires constant student reevaluation of role and scope and formal appraisal of institutional performance within role and scope. Students should be participants in the curricula determining process and in some instances, members of the governing boards.

Post-secondary institutions are also restricted by accreditation requirements. Students have a right to know these requirements in order to properly evaluate an institution's performance.

The members of the sub-committee feel that it is especially important that students are not deprived of quality education primarily because of cost.

Other ways in which the institutions can serve their students and be accountable to them include the following:

1. The concept of accountability obligates the institution to provide information and advice concerning jobs available in the student's field. It also obligates them to "ensure"

Sub-Committee #2: Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Student (Continued)

that knowledge acquired and skills learned have value in job and/or life style. Efforts, therefore, should be made to:

A. Develop area advisory committees composed of students and faculty to prepare such information.

B. Institute new agencies (or make older agencies such as the Employment Service more receptive to placement demands and employment information) to disseminate information to students and institutions.

C. Require wider circulation of current publications that indicate employment demands.

II. Accountability requires that the institution keep abreast of the times.

A. Employment projections in areas of institutional offerings should be constantly utilized to "ensure" that these offerings are current and relevant.

III. Accountability to students should guarantee the easy transferability of work taken at one institution to another.

A. Legislative resolutions are not adequate. Post-secondary institutions should be required by their governing boards to accept similar work from comparable institutions.

IV. One important way post-secondary education is accountable to the student is that an institution must perform as its catalog says it does.

Sub-Committee #2: Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Student (Continued)

A. Administration, governing boards, faculty and students must constantly compare institutional performance with catalog promise.

V. Within an institution, the faculty must also be accountable to students.

A. The responsibility of faculty members to students include remaining adapted to the continuously changing requirements of fields of knowledge in a dynamic society through instruction, through research and scholarship (in the universities) and through public service.

B. Toward these ends, the faculty may design and continually reevaluate instructional programs which will develop the student's capacities for learning.

C. The faculty establishes regulations and criteria for its own members, and assist in formulating these for students. The faculty must be well trained and competent.

D. It is true that faculty members have obligations to students other than in the classroom. (Research, public service, consulting, etc.). The institution must insure that imbalances among these activities not work to the disadvantage of the student; i.e., sometimes excessive time could be spent at one function which might work to the detriment of another essential activity.

VI. Accountability requires that students leaving an institution be given adequate counseling as to opportunities in other post-secondary institutions or fields of endeavor.

Sub-Committee #2: Accountability of Post-Secondary Education to the Student (Continued)

In summation, it is important that students have the means and the opportunity to evaluate the major components of the educational process: the institution, its curriculum, key personnel: (faculty and administration, and stated and apparent goals.)

Questionnaires provide workable methods of evaluation. The selection, administration, compilation, and interpretation of such questionnaires should be the coordinated responsibility of the alumni, the students, and the representatives of the group or policies being evaluated.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRELIMINARY REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTABILITY

Sub-Committee: Accountability of the Individual (Faculty, Student and Staff)

The committee recognizes that the accountability of individuals to their Institution is directly related to the purposes of the Institution. Such purposes vary significantly among Institutions--Universities, State Colleges, Community Colleges and Vo-Tech Centers.

Accountability, however admirable, is encompassed with the danger that a rigid system of evaluation and measurement imposed uniformly upon Institutions with varying purposes will seriously impair, rather than enhance, the ability of such Insitutions to accomplish their educational objectives. A lock-step system of accountability is too often favored by those who rank efficiency of operation above concern for the individual. Educational Institutions must, by their nature, uphold the sanctity of the individual against increasing inroads upon his liberty and individuality. The committee feels compelled to warn against a rigid, externally imposed system of accountability. Rather, the committee strongly recommends that each Institution be required to establish and enforce a system of accountability suited to its stated purposes and goals.

The following endeavors to encompass the collective overview of the purposes of post-secondary Institutions in Montana:

> Quality instruction in preparing students for work as well as promotion of scholarly interests of both students and faculty are primary purposes of the Institution.
>
> The underlying principle of the Institution is a commitment to the value of lifelong learning within all approaches along the contimum of education, including academic, vocational, avocational, physical, and aesthetic pursuits. To remove the availability of any one of these diminishes the scope of resources which will help develop and realize the broades capacities.
>
> In addition to educating for necessary employment skills, the Institution fosters the study of mankind--his dreams, abilities, values, environment, and limitations. The Institution introduces students to the wisdom and skills of man's cultures and helps students create beyond what already exists. All members of the Institution are encouraged to provide public service through responsible, creative application of scholarship, knowledge and skills to society's affairs and problems. A further purpose of each Institution is to extend its resources in the provision of meaningful community service.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Areas of Individual Accountability to the Institution

The Faculty

The faculty shall be held accountable to the Institution through observance of the following obligations:

The obligation to respect the rights of the Institution and its members.

The obligation to maintain high standards in the performance of instructional responsibilities appropriate to the needs of the Institution. Such responsibilities, as defined in the role of the Institution, may include, but are not limited to:

- Teaching duties and classroom performance.
- Work on various committees.
- Administrative duties.
- Activities unrelated to college but involved in community service.
- Research and publication.
- Formation of personal and departmental objectives.
- Advising and counseling students.
- Maintenance of personal scholarship, to include affiliation and participation with professional organizations and learned societies appropriate to one's academic discipline or vocational area.
- Student placement and follow up.

The obligation to maintain effective working relationships with members of the Institution and the public.

The obligation to provide public service through responsible application of scholarship, knowledge, and skills to society's affairs and problems, including the obligation to promote a mutually-advantageous relationship between the Institution and its patrons.

The obligation to provide service to the Institution through responsible application of scholarship, knowledge, and skills to the Institution's affairs and problems.

The obligation to practice reasonable standards of conduct in order to safeguard the educational process and to provide for the safety of the members of the Institution and the Institution's property.

Members of the Institution convicted of violations under general law may be subject to sanctions for the same conduct, in accord with policies and procedures.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The obligation to abide by stated rules, regulations, and procedures conditional to employment of institutional faculty and such stipulations as provided by contractual arrangement with the Institution.

The Students

The students shall be held accountable to the Institution and other members of the Institution through observance of the following obligations:

The obligation to respect the rights of the Institution and members of the institutional community.

The obligation to abide by federal, state, and local laws, as well as institutional rules and regulations; such rules and regulations usually prescribed upon matriculation of the student.

> ". . . Since there are appreciable differences between institutions in tradition, environment, mission, clientele, and institutional character, each unit of the Montana University System is authorized to establish rules and regulations for student conduct. . .that are appropriate to the unique needs of the institution."*

The obligation to devote their best efforts to the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the instructional programs and courses in which they are enrolled, through study, regular attendance, and participation in the educational activities appropriate to their program of studies.

The ethical obligation to serve with other students and faculty on appropriate committees, or in similar capacities, in search of more flexible educational programs, more effective teaching and learning methods, and more relevant educational goals.

The obligation not to interfere with the freedom of institutional members to pursue normal academic and administrative activities, including freedom of movement.

The obligation to encourage constructive relationships between the students and other members of the Institution; to promote a mutually-advantageous relationship between the Institution and the community; to foster the general welfare of the members; and to protect the privileges and rights of the institutional community.

---

*Regents of the Montana University System. June, 1970.

The Staff

The staff shall be held accountable to the Institution through observance of the following obligations:

The obligation to respect the rights of the Institution and members of the institutional community.

The obligation to satisfactorily complete assigned tasks within the scope of contractual responsibility.

The obligation to work cooperatively with other designated members of the Institution toward individual improvement and more efficient and productive work procedures.

The obligation for maintenance of a constructive attitude toward both the assigned job and the welfare of the Institution.

The obligation to accept reasonable modification of the work schedule and working conditions to accommodate the needs of the Institution.

The obligation to demonstrate supportive loyalty toward the immediate employer, supervisor, and the Institution.

The obligation to practice, and otherwise contribute to, good public relations and to foster relationships compatable with efficient institutional operation.

Robert Connole, University of Montana, Chairman
Bruce Moyer, Missoula Vo-Tech Center, Vice-Chairman
Jud Flower, Miles Community College
Harrison Lane, Northern Montana College
Marie Larish, Helena Vo-Tech Center
C. Robert Waterman, Eastern Montana College

DATE: January 8, 1974

TO: George L. Bousliman
Commission on Post Secondary Education

FROM: Sub-Committee #4 - Accountability of the Public and its Representatives to the Institution

RE: Resolutions relative to the accountability of the representatives of the public to the post secondary system in the State of Montana.

After countless hours studying "accountability" it appears that the best definition is that this concept denotes that whoever is given a task to perform, they should be held responsible or "accountable" for the results of his performance. The ones responsible would include the students, educators, and responsible public representatives.

All of these people have influences on education both within and outside of the school. The students, school staff - composed of teachers, administrators, specialists - and the public representatives all have impact upon student learning that is virtually impossible to disentangle.

The public representatives are responsible for providing the means and the technical assistance which the school staff uses to attain certain clearly defined and agreed upon student performances.

Definitions of Public Representatives

Elected: Legislature
Governor
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Local district school boards

Appointed: State Board of Education
Commissioner of Higher Education
Board of Regents of Higher Education
Board of Public Education
Commission on Post Secondary Education
Advisory Boards or Councils

Resolution No. 1

It is the responsibility of the public representatives to identify the educational needs of the people of Montana, to establish policies and goals consistent with the recognized needs, and to issue public statements relative to the above.

Resolution No. 2

The public representatives are responsible for establishing the goals of each of the post secondary education units in the State of Montana. These goals must be stated such that the spectrum of needs which a particular unit is to meet are defined. These goals would include, but not be limited to, continuous evaluation, research, curriculum and program development and review, etc.

Resolution No. 3

The public representatives are responsible to the public and thus to the institution to participate in developing goals and policies which cause the overall system to be financially feasible and financially sound.

Public representatives are responsible to both the public and to the institutions to establish and fund budgets consistent with stated goals and policies.

Further, the public representatives are responsible for acting to cause goals and policies to change openly and not by default. Political expediency is not to be justification for either establishment of or violation of stated goals or policies.

REVISED COPY

PRELIMINARY REPORT
January 10, 1974

JAMES HOFFMAN
Sub-Committee #5 Chairman Reporting

TECHNICAL GROUP ON ACCOUNTABILITY
Commission on Post-Secondary Education

General Meetings
November 9, 1973
January 29, 1974

Sub-Committee #5
Meetings
November 9, 1973
December 9, 1973

December 19, 1973
Conference call with Sub-Committee #6

Sub-Committee #5
"ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE ADMIN. TO THE STUDENT AND FACULTY"

JAMES HOFFMAN--Chrm.

MEMBERS: Galen Bummer
Victor Burt
Richard McConnan
Floyd Nobbs
W. Dewey Skelton
Alan Zetler

NATURE OF WORK

The Accountability Sub-Committee #5 met twice on November 9, and December 9, 1973, and the Chairman engaged in one conference call with Sub-Committee #6 on December 19, 1973.

The following work was done!!

1) Received clarification of charge from Commission Office.

2) Asked Post-Secondary Institution Administrators to respond by letter with their perceptions of "Accountability of the Administration to the Student and Faculty."

3) Wrote organizations such as AACJC, Educational Research Service, Inc., and the AASA, and individuals such as Raymond Schultz, Professor, Washington State University; Gary Fox, Professor, University of Missouri; Deb Das, Director, National Dessimination Project, State of Washington; and others for help for materials, etc.

4) Developed two accountability models or exercises for process of verification of decision making.
   a) Hierarchy Structure
      1. Goals in short-run and long-run for the institution, individuals, and groups.
   b) Contingency and Relevancy Matrixes
      1. Comparing sets of responsibilities

5) Three members drew up lists of administrative accountable items to the faculty and students in general terms and categories as they viewed them in their institutions.

DECISIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF GROUP

1. Specific charge dealth with responsibility from the top downward for accountability purposes. Accountability runs both ways, from the top down and from the bottom of the hierarchal level of responsibility upward and is not a cut and dried process as a framework for decision making.

2. Traditional classical hierarchal structure (Public, Legislators, Regents, Commissioner, Local Boards, President, Department Head, Faculty, Student) needs looking at as it probably doesn't recognize all the modes of feedback within and without an institution.

3. Overlaying levels of governance is the overall institutional goal perceived by everyone. Relevant goals congruence could be the crux of the whole problem.

4. Delineation of responsibility for decision making at each one of hierarchy levels needs to be determined.

5. There are sectors of education where information and power necessary to carry out responsibility can't be carried out unless in fact everyone else carries out or discharges their responsibility.

COMMENTS INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Exerpts From Correspondence:

"I would hope that the Sub-committee would, as a first step, define the illusive and illusitory term of 'accountability'."

"Accountability itself is suffering from the same malady it professes to cure--the lack of a precise definition and measuring stick. The definitions* of Educational Accountability are quite diverse and varied in rigor but in general seem to embody the concept that tasks, goals, and objectives are met gives a measure of "accountability" which can be expressed quantitatively and financially. That is, if satisfactory quantification can be achieved."

"I am quite sure that the Commission is interested in a quantifiable account rather than a subjective evaluation. Are we then thinking about some kind of administrative/faculty and administrative/student ratio? Or are we thinking about the number of dollars spent on administration compared to the number of dollars spent on instructional costs? If we are, then it is a foregone conclusion that the cost of administration will be proportionately much higher in smaller institutions than in the larger ones since there are certain administrative functions that must be carried out regardless of the size of the institution."

"We have different kinds of accountability: Legal accountability, philosophical or moral accountability, financial accountability, etc.etc., including self-accountability. Recently the term accountability has acquired a kind of special meaning, i.e., a performance audit."

"I suggest that before a performance audit can be very useful, that norms or standards are essential. These in turn have to be based on some assumption of resource availability and the concept of "availability" has to be subject to intensive scrutiny to validate the actuality of the apparent. I am skeptical of performance audits which are based on some arbitrarily selected comparative data, indicating that somewhere else or at some other time, under possibly quite different circumstances, someone else or some other group with a different configuration of resources did much better or much worse in their efforts to accomplish apparently similar goals."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Administration needs defining and accountability varies greatly with the position in the hierarchy. I feel my accountability is primarily to the Board which employs me."

"The best information brought to my attention involves a reminder that the full accountability includes the charge to the sub-committee in the form as presented to you. To change this to "institution accountability" would indeed change the inquiry before your sub-committee."

"I have real difficulty in separating students and faculty from the institution. It seems to me that together with administrators and supporting staff, students and faculty comprise the institution, and are, indeed, the sine qua non of a college or university. I suspect that what ideally we should be talking about is the institution's accountability to itself. But I am sure that with good reason nobody would buy that approach."

"I do not believe that the measure of the administrator's 'accountability' can be put on a scale. His overall effectiveness depends on his choice of personnel to carry out the objectives of the institution. As in the battle the success of the General lies with his Lieutenants, Sergeants, and Privates."

"My first concern is defining administration or administrators. What is it and who are they?"

"Accountability in its total dimensions has little correlation with any administrator's actual control over the events and circumstances which can skew a performance audit; particularly if it is related in time to some highly visible misfortune."

"I really don't see how your committee can proceed unless a definition of administration is of first concern."

CONCLUSIONS

We're working to make things that more confusing and complicated.

The idea of finding out what is the administrator's job and is he doing his job for the money paid him is probably a good exercise.

We haven't gotten a handle on this accountability charge as institutional and administrative responsibilities keep getting interwoven and inexorably they are a part of public consciousness of responsibility.

Defining administration or administrators--what is it and who they are--has not been done.

The word accountability itself has defied precise definiton as it gets tangled up with a great deal of other things. Implied in our charge is a special meaning of accountability--that of "performance audit."

This complicates matters further as each administrator's institution is different and the resources he has to work with varies considerably. Comparisons of performances through some time frame under such circumstances is impossible even though they may have apparently similar institutional goals.

Finally, the whole idea embodies the concept of financial and quantitative clearly expressed tasks, goals, and objectives and the degree they are met. The distinction between goals, objectives and tasks may be necessary somewhere along the line since we're talking about defining accountability in terms of performance of specific tasks.

Enclosed are two exercises we devised to get at responsibility.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Sub-Group #5

"ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO THE STUDENT AND FACULTY"

Design for feedback or process by which decisions are made--

Governance Hierarchy or Levels

PUBLIC
LEGISLATORS
REGENTS
COMMISSIONER
LOCAL BOARDS
PRESIDENT
DEANS--VICE PRES.
DEPT. HEAD
FACULTY
STUDENT

	Short Run	Long Run
Goals of Institution		
Individual *(objectives--goals and particular job objectives)		
Group		

*May be in conflict with one another or with institutional goals.

Hopes:
Overlaying all these Levels of Governance is the overall institutional goals perceived by everyone. The hope of Commonality, however, lies in the ultimate perception of the public as to the mission of Post-Secondary Education in Montana.

Basic Assumptions:

I. Our specific charge deals with responsibility from the top, downward for accountability purposes. We believe accountability runs both ways--both from the top down and from the bottom of the hierarchal level of responsibility upward and as a consequence is not an out and out cut and dried process but does provide the frame work by which decisions are made.

II. Use of traditional classical hierarchy structure--We need to take a look at this as this classical model may not be how the world really exists. We are using this merely as a starting point; however, realizing it probably doesn't recognize all the modes of feedback within and without an institution.

Work of the Committee:

EACH COMMITTEE MEMBER IS TO COMPLETE AND SEND TO ME AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE A RUN THROUGH MODEL AS A "PROCESS OF VERIFICATION" AN ACCOUNTABILITY DECISION SUCH AS THE HIRING AND FIRING OF AN EMPLOYEE FROM THE STANDPOINT OF OUR GOVERNANCE HIERARCHY AND ADMINISTRATOR FACULTY AND STUDENT INVOLVEMENT, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS GROUPS IN THE SHORT AND LONG RANGE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING.

Note: This could very well perhaps lead to delineation of responsibility for decision making at each of the hierarchy levels. Goals congruence could very well be the crux of the whole problem we face.

The meeting in Helena, Sunday, December 9th, was our last group meeting. All issues from now on will have to be resolved by other means and the final report drafted as a result.

James Hoffman

P.S. If you prefer some other decision other than hiring and firing for the verification process--feel free to do so; also, it is up to you whether you want to involve your administrator, faculty, or students in this verification exercise.

VO-TECH IDEAS

OF

ACCOUNTABILITY

William Skelton
Galen Bummer
Floyd Nobbs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

#5 - THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO THE STUDENT AND FACULTY

1. The Accountability of the Administration to the Student.

   a. Facility - The responsibility of the administration is to make sure that the students are housed in a learning situation that is well lighted and vented.

   b. Equipment - Since we are training people for the world of work or employment, it is necessary that new or modern equipment is available to the students in those programs where hands-on training is essential before going out into industry.

   c. Instructors - It is important that people teaching in the post-secondary education area are qualified and have adequate experience in the field in which they are teaching. It is also important that they keep informed about new developments in their area.

   d. Materials - Here we are talking about the materials needed for students in their training. In post-secondary education the materials needed vary from a small to large amount (ex. welding). It is essential that these materials be adequate, regardless of the size of the program.

   e. Student body organizations and student council should be provided so that the student can have a means of giving input to the administration. This is essential in order to set a better atmosphere between the students and the administration.

   f. Student services (ex. counseling) - The administration must make sure that there are adequate professional people that have the ability to talk, understand, and listen to young people and try to guide them into a successful training program.

   g. There must be flexibility in programing in order to satisfy employment needs. There must be job opportunities for those people leaving post-secondary education. Because of the changes in industry, the administration must be willing to change those programs already in existence or add new programs to meet the employment needs in the area.

   h. Placement Assistance - We feel there must be an adequate placement service in post-secondary education--A central area where students can come in and talk to a placement officer and where employers can call regarding the needs in their business. From here the placement officer can send qualified students to apply for the available jobs. This is one of the most important accountabilities of the administration to the student.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. The Accountability of the Administration to the Faculty.

   a. To provide the means to facilitate school operation and function.

   b. Budgeting - A working relationship with the faculty from the time the budget is prepared until the last penny is spent in an area. This is the only way to meet the needs of each program, and it is important that each instructor knows the exact amount he has in his program, or if the amount of his program budget is not what he orginally requested why this is so. It is important that these questions be answered in order to have a good working relationship between the faculty and administration.

   c. Policy Development - A working relationship between the faculty and administration in developing a policy pertaining to the school in general and perhaps the student. The faculty and administration should work together to develop a handbook for both teachers and students. All policies that are developed should be thoroughly researched and recognized by both the administration and faculty.

   d. Evaluation - Again, the administration and faculty must work together to come up with a strong evaluation form that is recognized and accepted by both groups. The evaluation should be used as an instrument in providing better teaching procedures and awareness.

   e. School Objectives - Here the administration and faculty must work together looking at the long-range objectives for both facility, students, and present needs. They must work together in evaluating the total system from the smallest program to the largest program.

Accountability of the administration to the students and the faculty.

Before this issue can be defined it must be stated that:

A. The primary objectives of post-secondary education are:

1. The development of the optimum educational capacity of the individual student.
2. To develop the capacity to cope with the social and economic world of today and tomorrow.

B. That the responsibility for the development of the students human potential is not the sole responsibility of the institution of higher learning. It must be noted that the students characteristics, home and community influence and limit the educational process.

Accountability of the administration to the students and faculty.

Definition:

Accountability may be defined as the process in which the educational institution assumes the role of preparing a student for contributing membership in the social and economical world of today and tomorrow.

The success of this process depends on the ability and background of the student and the educational process that develops the students maximum potential.

Since the students ability and background are variable factors over which the educational institutions have no control, the educational process is the major area of accountability.

The process governing the responsibility for the administration of the educational process can be divided into four phases:

A. Planning

1. Developing organizational goals and objectives.
2. Developing personal job functions and performance objectives.
3. Developing an implementation system.
4. Developing a management system.
5. Developing a evaluation system.

B. Implementation

1. Input to achieve goals and objectives of the plan.

C. Management

1. Physical plant

2. Educational process

3. Personnel

D. Evaluation

1. Measurement of output of faculty and students.

2. Corrective measures to improve performance.

Included in this administrative process are the following specific areas of responsibility:

1. Physical plant (conducive learning and teaching enviornment)

2. Equipment.

3. Supplies (materials)

4. Curriculum (programs, instructional strategies)

5. Budget
   a. Present
   b. Future planning
   c. Research

6. Policy (Regulations governing staff and students)

7. Planning (Goals and objectives, meaningful co-ordination)

8. Public Relations

9. Internal personal relationships

10. Leadership (Management)

11. Student guidance & counseling (Career and Social)

12. Scheduling (adequate time for teacher and student)

13. Job Placement

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. Instructional staff

    a. Hiring qualified teachers
    b. Pay scale
    c. Training and development
    d. Morale
    e. Efficient use of talent
    f. Job Descriptions

15. Health Services

16. Communications (open system)

17. Evaluation & Improvement (Relevant programs, staff & student performance, teacher and student input.)

The process developed by the Michigan Department of Education, to determine accountability states:

a. Identify goals for the schools,

b. Spell out each goal in measurable terms,

c. Assess where we are in relation to where we want to be,

d. Analyze the programs for delivering educational service to students,

e. Evaluate, and

f. Recommend improvements.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GREAT FALLS VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTER
1015 FIRST AVENUE NORTH — P. O. BOX 2428
GREAT FALLS, MONTANA 59403

January 8, 1974

Mr. James Hoffman, M.A., President
Dawson College
300 College Drive
Glendive, Montana 59330

Dear Sir:

I feel as frustrated as you do in trying to define this accountability problem as it was handed to us. After wrestling with it, I seem to draw a complete blank as to what to do, but as late as it is, I'll attempt some sort of a response.

It appears to me that the Post-Secondary Vocational Technical Centers have become three public interests which is reflected by state legislative action, resulting in funds earmarked for that purpose. With these funds the chain of command seems to start with the Vo-Tech Department of the Superintendent of Public Instructions Office.

To my knowledge the accountability function seems to come into full play from the State Director of Vocational Education. His responsibility to the various centers for guidance and fund allocation as well as approval for either new or on-going programs.

At the local level an accountability chain is created between the School Board and local Director of Post-Secondary Vocational Education and his administrative assistants. Accountability exists here as a two-way street. First from administration to the instructors; securing qualified instructors for the appropriate fields they will teach in; second, in providing the necessary materials and environment necessary to carry out their programs within monetary budget limits. I also feel it is administrations responsibility to make the instructors aware that budgetary limits do exist and that there may be a limit to the amount of money available for programs.

It then becomes the instructor's responsibility or accountability, to work towards creating a meaningful curriculum for a course of study, working with the administrative staff. Through this process, said curriculum can be created and maintained to keep it as up to date as possible.

Administration, while being accountable to the staff needs, must be accountable to the students of their institution. It is my feeling that this can be accomplished through a student government organization and then working with the student government.

An accountability chain basically exists somewhat in this form and I also feel that said chain is a two-way communication link, both downward from all levels of administration through the teachers and ultimately to the student as well as upward from the student through the teachers to all levels of the administration.

It is my feeling that this type of accountability could be desirable and an appropriate authority, for decision making go hand in hand with the degree of accountability imposed on the individuals involved.

Sincerely,

Floyd T. Nobbs, Instructor
Data Processing
Great Falls Vo-Tech Center

FTN:bj

Contingency Matrix
(comparing two sets of responsibilities at the same time)

List

admin	faculty
i.e. Instructional Arrangement convenient to learning	Improve Learning Process

Look for: critical contingency - Disregard minor effects - concentrate on academic year for effects as in long run with enough time everything becomes contingent on everything else -

Place where responsibility effects responsibility of everyone else.

(Don't consider for example such an item as: "Keep up with what is new in his profession" - effect might not show up over long time period of the instructor's teaching".

Examples of Items to List and Consider!!

1. Make reports ---------Doesn't affect faculty or students for audit
2. Keep operative facilities in order to enhance learning ---------Affects faculty - affects student learning environment

Estimate of Contingency in List Compiled!!

Discharging Responsibility - can't carry out responsibility unless in fact everyone else carries out their responsibility. Contingent on this, that everyone discharges their responsibility - dependency 5 to 10% or not more than one-fourth of list in this category of being truly contingent if being critical about obvious relationship where strong contingency exists.

Contingency Matrix (continued)

II. Are there sectors of education where information and power necessary to carry out these responsibilities is lacking? What is necessary to provide that information and power to carry out these identifiable responsibilities? How can it be provided to check performance?

With information and corresponding power to change output an administrator can then be held accountable for that output.

Example Accountable Gone Haywire!!

Publish or Perish - doesn't have direct influence over short run on student and his learning - used as instructor accountability measure, however - doesn't make sense - should be his problem rather than university problem or concern.

III. Best methods to see if job done.
Easy to see if job not reached.

Example: Admissions officer - charged with student recruitment if students don't show - then is the person fired because he hasn't carried out his accountability.

Relevancy Matrix

Goal Related to What Goal
highly related - each can be pursued independently or in connection with one another.

RELEVANT BUT NOT CONTINGENT

i.e. student concern to succeed on the job	(Relevant but not contingent)	Instructional methods related to the world of work

CONTINGENT BUT NOT RELEVANT

i.e. janitorial Services	(because contingent but not relevant)	Social Science instructor improving his course

(If strike and things pile up)

Two Exercises For You To Attempt!	Wipe out goal relevancy and then consider contingency matrix.
	Involve faculty and students if you so desire in developing these responsibility and goal lists and relating them to contingency and relevancy criteria for your institution.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TECHNICAL GROUP ON ACCOUNTABILITY

PRELIMINARY REPORT SUBCOMMITTEE # 6

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRITERIA AND METHODS OF DETERMINING EFFECTIVENESS AND PROGRESS IN MEETING GOALS

After several meetings of the subcommittee it became readily apparent that before we proceed with the task of devising criteria and methods of evaluation to determine progress toward goals, the appropriate goals must be identified. Since goal identification is inherent in the task of the other five subcommittees, we should utilize the goals identified by the other subcommittees in order to assure commonality and compatibility within the total accountability committee. We have contacted the other subcommittees and requested that the preliminary reports of the other subcommittees contained goal statements that are measurable with some degree of specificity. We realize that some goal statements may not lend themselves to quantification and therefore, could not be measured in that fashion.

The Committee agreed that upon receipt of the preliminary reports of the other subcommittees, we would proceed with our assignment along the following lines:

We should recommend the use of standardized instruments for measurement rather than the invention of our own. Probably each instrument will have to be modified in some way in order to meet the particular needs of this system, but it would be folly to try to invent our own when that task has already been done, and home grown instruments will not permit regional and national comparisons.

In a good many instances, in spite of the need for standardized instruments of measure, forms will have to vary from institution to institution in order to harmonize with the specific mission of each institution.

We must maintain a continual awareness of the values and activities in higher education that are not readily measurable in quantitative terms. Each report and perhaps each instrument should carry a statement to this effect. In certain instances we will probably want to recommend subjective analysis of data for the sake of accountability rather than quantitative measures. This will be particularly true when dealing with "outcome."

We must be concerned with the cost of accountability even though that is not a specific consideration in our charge. Accountability processes are obviously very expensive and we must make a decision about the value of specific bodies of information as opposed to the cost of collecting that information.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 4 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION